

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
ROANOKE DIVISION**

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| STEVE RIDDICK, |) | CASE NO. 7:20CV00096 |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| v. |) | MEMORANDUM OPINION |
| |) | |
| JEFFREY B. KISER, <u>ET AL.</u>, |) | By: Glen E. Conrad |
| |) | Senior United States District Judge |
| Defendants. |) | |

This case is presently before the court on Plaintiff Steve Riddick’s motion seeking a “protective order,” ECF No. 112, to direct prison officials not to retaliate against him for filing thirteen lawsuits about prison conditions. The court finds no merit to the motion.

As the court has clearly advised Riddick in past opinions and orders, preliminary injunctive relief is an extraordinary remedy. Thus, the party seeking such relief must make a clear showing “that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). Each of these four factors must be satisfied. Id. In support of his motion, Riddick offers only his speculative fear of unspecified types of retaliation for his litigation efforts. Because he fails to state facts satisfying the required factors for the relief he seeks, the court will summarily deny his motion. An appropriate order will issue herewith.

ENTER: This 20th day of January, 2021.



Senior United States District Judge